

Appl. No. 10/596679
Amdt. Dated November 19, 2009
Reply to Office action of August 19, 2009
Attorney Docket No. P15013
EUS/GJP/09-2834

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Fig 3.

Attachment: Annotated Sheets of Drawings Showing Changes
Submittal of Drawing Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 31 and 33; claims 23, 30 and 39 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 24-29, 31-38 and 40-44 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 23, 29-33, 38, 40-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 6,275,708 to Lahtinen. The Applicants have incorporated elements of claims 23 and 30 into claim 31. The elements of claim 39 have been incorporated into claim 33. Claims 23, 30 and 39 have been canceled.

Claim 30 provided:

wherein the paging transactions are of at least one kind selected from the group consisting of Call Control transactions, Supplementary Services transactions, Short Message Service transactions and Location Services transactions.

The Examiner stated:

Regarding claim 30, Lahtinen teaches the method of claim 23, wherein the paging transactions are of at least one kind selected from the group consisting of Call Control transactions, Supplementary Services transactions, Short Message Service transactions and Location Services transactions (i.e. Lahtinen teaches that the calls to be initiated (paging requests) may be due to incoming voice calls (i.e. call control); Col. 2, lines 5-9).

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Lahtinen discloses the above referenced element. Lahtinen, Col.. 2, lines 5-9 provides:

Prior art systems cannot prevent overload in a mobile system in this situation. Normal network operation can also cause overload in a mobile system if an exceptionally large number of subscribers is located in a particular location area LA, and they load the base station subsystem BSS with calls and location updates.

Nowhere in this reference does it disclose paging transactions being one of a Call Control transaction, Supplementary Services transaction, Short Message Service transaction or Location Services transaction. Claim 33 provides the analogous element "wherein the memory means comprise stored therein respective maximum numbers indicative of the maximum number of allowed ongoing paging Call Control transactions, Supplementary Services transactions, Short Message Service transactions and Location Service transactions, respectively, the comparing means being set so as the checking is performed for each of the Call Control transactions, Supplementary Services transactions, Short Message Service transactions and Location Service transactions, respectively..."

Claim 31 provides the further element: "...wherein a respective maximum number which is allowed for the location area is defined for paging transactions of each of the kind comprising Call Control transactions, Supplementary Services transactions, Short Message Service transactions and Location Services transactions, respectively, the checking step being performed for each kind of transaction."

The Examiner states:

Regarding claim 31, Lahtinen teaches the method of claim 30, wherein a respective maximum number which is allowed for the location area is defined for paging transactions of each of the kind comprising Call Control transactions, Supplementary Services transactions, Short Message Service transactions and Location Services transactions, respectively, the checking step being performed for each kind of transaction (i.e. Lahtinen teaches limiting the number of calls to be initiated (i.e. paging requests) to a predetermined value (maximum number) and applies this to incoming voice calls; Col. 3, lines 16-24).

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Col. 3, lines 16-24 disclose the above referenced element. Col. 3, lines 16-24 provide:

The invention is described below with reference to call limiting in a single mobile services switching centre. It is advantageous to limit the calls of a mobile services switching centre MSC especially when updating the mobile station MS location information stored in the visitor location register VLR by inquiries directed to the mobile stations. The method of the invention can also be applied to limiting calls that pass via a given base station subsystem BSS.

The cited provision makes no reference to the type of paging transactions allowed for an area wherein the paging transactions are one of a Call Control transaction, Supplementary Services transaction, Short Message Service transaction or Location Services transaction, wherein the checking step of prior claim 23 (now incorporated into claim 31) is being performed for each kind of transaction.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 24 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahtinen in view of GB 2350918 to Joensuu et al. and US 2002/0171581 to Sheynblat et al. Claim 24 has been amended to depend from amended claim 31 and claim 34 depends from amended claim 33. Lahtinen fails to disclose material elements of independent claims 31 and 33 and Joensuu and Sheynblat fail to remedy the deficiencies. Therefore, the allowance of claims 24 and 34 is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-28 and 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahtinen, Joensuu, and Sheynblat as applied to claims 24 and 34 above, and further in view of US 2006/0128395 to Muhonen. Lahtinen fails to disclose material elements of independent claims 31 and 33, from which claims 25-28 and 35-37 depend, respectively and Joensuu, Sheynblat and Muhonen fail to remedy the deficiencies. Therefore, the allowance of claims 25-28 and 35-37 is respectfully requested.

Claim 39 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahtinen. The element of Claim 39 has been incorporated into claim 33 and claims 39 has been canceled. As noted above, Lahtinen fails to disclose this element.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael G. Cameron
Registration No. 50.298

Date: November 19, 2009

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145
michael.cameron@ericsson.com